

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Societa Italiana di M. S. San Donato val di Comino, favoring October 12 as a national holiday in honor of Columbus—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of clear Habana cigar manufacturers of the United States, against graduated tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles H. Schieren Company and Pfister & Vogel Leather Company, both of New York, for free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of a committee of consumers of New York, favoring an equitable tariff, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEBB: Petition of citizens of North Carolina, favoring a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

## SENATE.

FRIDAY, July 16, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

The VICE-PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

### SENATOR FROM GEORGIA.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague [Mr. CLAY], who has been elected for the term beginning the 4th of March last. I ask that the same be read and placed on file.

The credentials of ALEXANDER S. CLAY, chosen by the legislature of the State of Georgia a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1909, were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. BACON. My colleague is present and ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk.

Mr. CLAY was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. BACON, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

### FOREIGN PRODUCTS IN DOMESTIC MARKETS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, in further response to resolutions of March 6 and April 5, 1909, additional reports from consular and other representatives abroad relating to the practice of selling foreign manufactured goods in this country at a price lower than the domestic price (S. Doc. No. 16, pt. 3), which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

### LAWS OF ARIZONA.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the session laws of the twenty-fifth legislative assembly of the Territory of Arizona, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Territories.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 11579) to amend an act relative to the erection of a lock and dam in aid of navigation in the Tennessee River, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. R. 40) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DEPEW presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Rochester, N. Y., and a memorial of the Employers' Association of Utica, N. Y., remonstrating against the imposition of the proposed tax on corporations, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the executive committee of the New York Mercantile Exchange, of New York

City, N. Y., relative to a reduction of the duty on butter, cheese, and eggs, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the East New York Cooperative Savings and Building Loan Association, of Brooklyn; of the Mount St. Vincent Cooperative Building and Loan Association, of New York City; of the Brooklyn Mutual Building and Loan Association, of Brooklyn; of the Savings, Loan and Building Association, of Watertown; of the National Surety Company, of New York City; of Staten Island Lodge, No. 56, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Staten Island; of Local Lodge, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Binghamton; of the Savings and Loan Association, of Niagara Falls; of the Tuckahoe Home-Building and Loan Association, of Tuckahoe; and of J. F. Bingham Lodge, No. 155, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of New York City, all in the State of New York, praying that building and loan associations be exempted from the proposed tax on corporations, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the New York Team Owners' Association, of New York City, N. Y., praying that oats, hay, and horses be placed on the free list, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BURTON presented resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Columbus, Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed tax on corporations, which were ordered to lie on the table.

### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2179) to authorize and empower J. L. Hankinson, N. B. Dial, and their associates, successors, and assigns to construct a dam, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 14) thereon.

Mr. MARTIN. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2828) to authorize Bradley County, Ark., to construct a bridge across Saline River, in said county and State, to report it without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 16) thereon.

This is a local bill in which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. DAVIS], who is absent, is very much interested. At his instance, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate for its present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. I have, myself, no objection at all to the bill, but I do not see how it is possible for us to deviate from the unanimous-consent agreement. I was obliged to object the other day to the bill reported by the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] from the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I feel that I must object to the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MARTIN. I merely desire to say that notwithstanding the understanding that general business would not be taken up, quite a number of bridge bills have been passed by the Senate. I have no interest whatever in this matter. In the absence of the Senator from Arkansas, I made the request. If this course is to be pursued, it must be applied universally. I do not understand why it is that Senators will sit here and see bill after bill passed, and then object to this local measure.

Mr. LODGE. The proposition was made at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was reached to except bridge bills, and the exception was not made. The unanimous-consent agreement is absolute. I objected the other day, and so did the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], to the consideration of the bill the Senator from Montana [Mr. CARTER] reported. I think we ought to adhere to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MARTIN. I fully concur in that statement, but I have seen perhaps a dozen of these bills passed.

Mr. LODGE. Not since the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into.

Mr. MARTIN. I beg pardon; that transpired in my absence, I suppose.

Mr. LODGE. Nothing has been passed since by unanimous consent it was agreed to take an adjournment from three days to three days.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand it now. I was not present when the agreement was made.

Mr. LODGE. That is the unanimous-consent agreement I alluded to. The Senator will find it printed on the first page of the calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2827) to extend the time for construction of a bridge across the Ouachita River at or near Camden, Ark., reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 15) thereon.

## BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FRYE:

A bill (S. 2943) granting a pension to Susan B. Merrill (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (by request):

A bill (S. 2944) for the relief of the heirs of Daniel Donovan; to the Committee on Claims.

## AMENDMENT TO DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment providing that the unexpended balance of the appropriation of \$4,500 made to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1909, be made available and reappropriated to be expended as additional compensation to the employees of the Senate who performed clerical and other extra services, and so forth, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## WATER SUPPLY OF CIALES, P. R.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 130), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

In accordance with section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900 (31 Stat., 84), entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress certified copy of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico June 25, 1909, entitled "An ordinance granting the right to the municipality of Ciales to take 7 liters of water per second from the brook Cojo Bales, municipal district of Ciales, for the purpose of supplying the inhabitants of the municipality with water," approved by the acting governor June 29, 1909.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1909.

## BRIDGE ACROSS CONDADO BAY, PORTO RICO.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 131), which was read and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

In accordance with section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900 (31 Stat., 84), entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress certified copy of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico June 25, 1909, entitled "An ordinance granting to Behn Brothers the right to construct a bridge and the approaches thereto across a portion of the Condado Bay at the eastern extremity of San Juan Island," approved by the acting governor June 29, 1909.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1909.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 11579. An act to amend an act relative to the erection of a lock and dam in aid of navigation in the Tennessee River was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

After five minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened, and (at 12 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, July 20, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate July 16, 1909.*

## REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas E. Olsgard, of Minot, N. Dak., to be register of the land office at Minot, N. Dak., vice Luther D. McGahan, resigned.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Capt. William Edward Reynolds to be a senior captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as

such from July 9, 1909, in place of Capt. Fredric Montford Munger, retired.

First Lieut. Claude Stanley Cochran to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from July 9, 1909, in place of Capt. William Edward Reynolds, promoted.

First Lieut. Charles Ernest Johnston to be a captain in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from January 28, 1909, in place of Capt. Alexander Perry Rodgers Hanks, promoted.

Second Lieut. Philip Wales Lauriat to be a first lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from December 30, 1908, in place of First Lieut. James Guy Ballinger, promoted.

Third Lieut. Joseph Raoul Besse to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from December 31, 1908, in place of Second Lieut. Philip Wales Lauriat, promoted.

Third Lieut. Edward Joseph Donohue to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from December 30, 1908, in place of Second Lieut. William Ambrose O'Malley, promoted.

Third Lieut. James Pine to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from December 30, 1908, in place of Second Lieut. John Lovejoy Maher, promoted.

Third Lieut. Michael John Ryan to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from January 2, 1909, in place of Second Lieut. William Henry Munter, promoted.

Third Lieut. Warner Kieth Thompson to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from December 31, 1908, in place of Second Lieut. Eben Barker, promoted.

Third Lieut. William Francis Towle to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, to rank as such from January 2, 1909, to fill a vacancy created by the act approved April 16, 1908.

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

## FIELD ARTILLERY ARM.

*To be second lieutenants, with rank from July 14, 1909.*

Master Gunner Lucien Helm Taliaferro, Coast Artillery Corps.  
Sergt. Harold Hubert Bateman, Troop D, Fifth Cavalry.

## CAVALRY ARM.

Battalion Sergt. Maj. John Charles Fremont Tillson, jr., Fourth Infantry.

Pvt. Paul Christopher Raborg, Troop H, Fifteenth Cavalry.

## INFANTRY ARM.

Corp. Vernon George Olsmith, Company H, Twenty-sixth Infantry.

Master Gunner Ralph Ernest Jones, Coast Artillery Corps.  
Pvt. Earle Marian Chant, One hundred and sixty-eighth Company Coast Artillery Corps.

Master Gunner John Sehorn Singleton, Coast Artillery Corps.

## COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

*To be second lieutenants, with rank from July 12, 1909.*

Edward Cornelius Hanford, of Washington, late second lieutenant, First Cavalry, United States Army.

Midshipman William Charles Koenig, United States Navy.

Midshipman Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Navy.

## CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 16, 1909.*

## CONSULS.

Fred C. Slater to be consul at Sarnia, Ontario, Canada.

Robert Frazer, jr., to be consul at Valencia, Spain.

## COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

William R. Leaken to be collector of customs for the district of Savannah, Ga.

## PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named machinists to be chief machinists in the navy:

William R. Scofield,  
Henry Smith,  
William W. Booth,  
John H. Busch,  
William E. Stiles, and  
Adolph A. Gathemann.

## POSTMASTER.

Hardy C. Fryer, at Blakely, Ga.



## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, July 16, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock in.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## INCOME TAX—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. R. 40. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the report of the Committee on Enrolled Bills, which has just been submitted by the Chair to the House, I desire to inquire whether the Speaker thinks it necessary to submit the Senate joint resolution No. 40 to the President for his signature?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not quite grasp the gentleman's question.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Chair has just laid before the House a report of the Committee on Enrolled Bills, which states that Senate joint resolution No. 40, providing for an amendment to the Constitution giving Congress the power to levy an income tax without regard to the census or enumeration, has been signed; and I desire to know whether the Speaker will transmit that resolution to the President for his signature?

I know the precedents, and I know that it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Third Dallas—in the case of *Hollingsworth v. Virginia*. It has been heretofore ruled by a former Speaker, when the question was raised, that it was not necessary to submit the resolution to amend the Constitution to the President for his approval. I call the Chair's attention to the matter now, in order that the Chair's attention may be called to the precedents in this regard, and for the other purpose, Mr. Speaker, that if it is necessary, the House may take such usual and necessary methods in the premises to have the States of the Union informed of the action of the Congress in this respect. I have already had letters from members of the legislature in my State, which is now in session, inquiring relative to the matter; and because of my interest in it and because of the interest in it of the legislature in my State, I have called the matter to the attention of the Speaker, so that whatever is necessary to be done may be done as speedily as possible. It is because of that precedent and because of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to which I refer, which decision arose upon the eleventh amendment to the Constitution, that I have thought proper to direct the Chair's attention to the subject now.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that this joint resolution originated in the Senate. It was passed by the House, and the joint resolution, duly enrolled, is signed by the Speaker and reported to the House, and it will be transmitted from the House to the Senate, in which body it originated, and the uniform practice is that the body originating the measure transmits it to the proper depository.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. If the Chair will pardon me in the matter a moment, I think it is the duty of Congress—and I think a concurrent resolution to that effect will be proper—to authorize the transmission of this resolution to the executives of the various States; and if the Speaker will turn the page of the book to which he is now referring, *Hinds' Precedents*, on the top of the next page he will find a precedent for that action, which was taken in the case of the amendments submitted after the civil war. This precedent will be found in volume 5, page 1018, section 7042, *Hinds' Parliamentary Precedents*.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is satisfied that under the practice of the House, as well as of the Senate, the body originating the measure disposes of it, either by sending it to the President, on the one hand, or depositing it in the proper place, on the other. Just which House should originate the concurrent resolution requesting transmission of the situation to the States it is not necessary for the Chair to determine at this time; and, in fact, the Chair, until examination, has no opinion in the premises, and the question does not arise at this time.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

On July 12, 1909:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to loan cots, tents, and appliances for the use of the forty-third national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic at Salt Lake City, Utah.

On July 15, 1909:

H. R. 9609. An act to grant to John Rivett privilege to make commutation of his homestead entry; and

H. R. 9541. An act to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900.

## PORTO RICO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 131), which was read, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

In accordance with section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900 (31 Stat., 84), entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress certified copy of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico June 25, 1909, entitled "An ordinance granting to Behn Brothers the right to construct a bridge and the approaches thereto across a portion of the Condado Bay at the eastern extremity of San Juan Island," approved by the acting governor June 29, 1909.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1909.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States (S. Doc. No. 130), which was read, referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

In accordance with section 32 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900 (31 Stat., 84), entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress certified copy of a franchise granted by the executive council of Porto Rico June 25, 1909, entitled "An ordinance granting the right to the municipality of Ciales to take 7 liters of water per second from the brook Cojo Bales, municipal district of Ciales, for the purpose of supplying the inhabitants of the municipality with water," approved by the acting governor June 29, 1909.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 16, 1909.

## WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. MONDELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Dennis Driscoll, Sixtieth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

## AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION.

Mr. HARDY rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the joint resolution which the Senate and the House has agreed to submit to the States, I have a matter to which I think there is no objection, and I would like to ask unanimous consent to present and consider the resolution which I ask to be read at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Please send the resolution to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, we are unable to hear what the request is.

Mr. HARDY. I will be glad to state what the request is. The request is that at the same time the income-tax amendment is submitted that we submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution to enable inaugurations to be held on the 4th day of April instead of on the 4th day of March hereafter. It seems to me it is—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent, as the Chair understands, for the present consideration of the following joint resolution, the title of which the Clerk will read.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the object of the request and I must object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard, the gentleman saying he understands the object of the request.

Mr. BURLESON. He must be a mind reader, then.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas stated what it was.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that will be considered as equivalent to a demand for the regular order.

Mr. KEIFER. I have no objection to its being read, but I object to its consideration.

The SPEAKER. If objection is withdrawn or withheld, the Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk began the reading of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, objection is not withdrawn except that it may be read as part of the gentleman's request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the objection is withheld until the joint resolution is read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution:*

ART. XVII. That the terms of office of newly elected Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States shall begin on the 4th day of April instead of the 4th day of March, in the same manner as heretofore provided under the Constitution, and that the terms of office of the President and Vice-President of the United States shall begin on the 4th day of April every fourth year, and their induction into office take place on the 4th day of April instead of the 4th day of March, as heretofore provided under the Constitution, and that for the interim between the 4th day of March and the 4th day of April of the years when this amendment shall first have application the holding of Members of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States shall continue to act and hold in their capacities, rights, and duties as Representatives, Senators, and President and Vice-President of the United States.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects to the consideration of the resolution.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the appropriation bill now before the House.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11570) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1909, and for other purposes, Mr. WANGER in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional amount for the additional accommodations to the building erected for the offices of the President, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, including heating apparatus and light fixtures, and furniture, all to be done according to plans, the details of which shall be approved by the President, and completed in every respect within the sums hereby and heretofore appropriated, \$13,500, to be expended by contract or otherwise, in the discretion and under the direction of the President, to continue available during the fiscal year 1910.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] how much was appropriated before for this purpose?

Mr. TAWNEY. Forty thousand dollars. I will state, for the information of the committee, that this appropriation for enlarging the executive offices of the President originated in the Senate as an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill. There has been no estimate submitted; there has been no investigation as to the amount necessary to complete that addition. Since the making of that appropriation the engineer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia has prepared plans and specifications for the construction of this addition, and they have been approved by the President, as required, but the construction can not be completed within the limit of cost. It will require \$13,500 in addition to the amount already appropriated. It is very necessary that it be done at this session, for under the law making the appropriation of \$40,000 they can not make a contract, they can not begin the work at all, until the full amount is appropriated which it is estimated the building will cost.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. How much did that house cost originally?

Mr. TAWNEY. My recollection is that the improvements all told were between \$500,000 and \$600,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not talking about what the ruination of the White House cost.

Mr. TAWNEY. About \$60,000 was the cost of the executive offices of the President.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to know, if you know or anybody else knows, how they could manage to spend \$60,000 on that little brick house with only six rooms in it, and with a cellar for the purpose of containing the heating apparatus. That is one of the mysteries of the world to me.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have never had occasion to investigate the cost of material or the contract, but that \$60,000 includes not only the building, but it includes all the equipment and furnishings for the building.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. You have what Governor Dingley used to call "surface information" about building houses, and I submit to you individually, if you do not believe that house can be duplicated for \$10,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not. I do not believe it can be duplicated by a private citizen, who, of course, always builds for less than the Government.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is going to be done to this house in order to absorb this \$33,000?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentlemen there is no question pending before the committee unless a motion be made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the motion to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. MADDEN. How does he arrive at the fact that the building will cost \$60,000?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] just said so.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not see how you can figure it out, as all the improvements were made together. I do not see how you can separate one part from the other.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] that there was a limitation on the cost of the executive offices of the President. That limitation was \$60,000. I think the cost, while it did not exceed the limit of cost, was up fully to that limit.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly willing for the executive offices to be enlarged. I think they ought to be.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will answer the gentleman's question further by saying that this extension is to be on the south side. The ground was formerly used as a tennis court.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where are they going to have the tennis court?

Mr. TAWNEY. I suppose out in Rock Creek Park.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. At Chevy Chase.

Mr. TAWNEY. If the gentleman will turn to page 106 of the hearings, he will there find a complete statement of the proposed changes and an itemized statement of the cost, the aggregate cost being \$53,500.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the building they are going to do?

Mr. TAWNEY. They are going to enlarge the present building.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. For this sum you ought to build over the big end of that lot.

Mr. TAWNEY. It will be almost double the size of the present offices.

Mr. BURLESON. Here is what the alterations will be:

These include a larger and more dignified room for the President's office, separate waiting rooms for congressional visitors and for the general public in addition to the present lobby, a larger telegraph office, another room for clerks, and additional toilet rooms, besides a number of minor improvements.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman from Texas, with the permission of the gentleman from Minnesota, whether it will contain a room for the waiting Members of the House who are waiting until Senators are disposed of?

Mr. BURLESON. Why, certainly it will.

Mr. MANN. That is, a separate apartment for that purpose?

Mr. BURLESON. There is room for the Members on the outside.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I simply want to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota to this state of affairs. A few weeks ago there was issued from the White House a ukase that we should have economy under this administration. The Secretary of War went to work, and in a few minutes cut \$56,000,000 out of the army appropriations, and then the Secretary of the Navy in a few minutes cut \$20,000,000 out of the naval appropriations. Well, now, if they keep up that rate of progress, we will cut these bills down to something reasonable; but here yesterday we voted \$25,000 for the President's traveling expenses that might have been saved, and now you are fixing to appropriate another \$53,000 to build five or six rooms to enlarge the executive offices.



Mr. MANN. Thirteen thousand dollars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It all figures up \$53,000. There are only six rooms in that building down there that cost \$65,000, and two or three of them are very small rooms. I am perfectly willing that the President of the United States should have all the room that he needs; but I think that it is an absolutely wicked waste of the public money to appropriate \$53,000 for such a building down there, and no mortal man can justify any such performance.

Mr. PRINCE. I desire to make an inquiry of the gentleman from Minnesota. I notice in the Record of yesterday, on page 4472, a gentleman in making his speech said this:

The next item in this bill which I shall oppose, Mr. Chairman, will be the \$13,500 increase to build an additional room to the President's office. I shall oppose this for the reason that in it is included \$3,000 which is to be paid to an architect, and \$3,000 to a superintendent, making \$6,000. The architects which the Government has are not competent enough, it seems, to draw the plans and specifications for a room or two to be added to that office, Mr. Chairman.

What is there of truth in that statement?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, that with the amount of work the Supervising Architect of the Treasury has, it was impossible for him to prepare plans, if he would have authority. The engineer in charge of this work has informed me, and those associated with me in the preparation of this bill, that the employment of an outside architect for this purpose was absolutely necessary. He has no one in his office who, as an architect, is qualified to prepare plans and specifications for this building.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I will state to the gentleman that the Supervising Architect of the Treasury never draws plans or prepares specifications except for the Treasury Department on buildings that have been authorized by law.

Mr. PRINCE. The question I wish to submit is this: Do I understand the gentleman's statement to be true, that when we are to employ an architect to prepare plans for a building, costing at the outside \$53,000, that we are to pay \$3,000 for preparing plans of that kind?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois, in the first place, that the employment of an outside architect is absolutely necessary; in the second place, the fee that the outside architect draws is fixed by the organization of architects all over the United States. It is between 5 and 6 per cent. I think it is now 6 per cent.

Mr. PRINCE. That means that the \$3,000 includes his expense there as to the superintendency of the building and watching the material that goes into it?

Mr. MANN. Supervision, not superintendence.

Mr. PRINCE. Now, here is an item of \$3,000 for that superintendence.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. No; that is not correct.

Mr. PRINCE. That is what I want to know.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The estimate was for \$3,000 for superintendence, inspection, plans, and sundry expenses. That is the miscellaneous item of expenditure, \$3,000, which is not specifically itemized.

Mr. TAWNEY. The statement referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRINCE] is not correct.

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the architect furnish the plans?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. He furnishes most of the plans; yes. I should like to state, Mr. Chairman, that when this appropriation of \$40,000 was made, it was not known whether this improvement would be made by erecting a second story to this office building or by extending the office building to the south. The amount named was therefore a mere guide to the architect as to about what Congress meant to spend in the way of making that improvement. Now, when the architect was employed, he was not employed as one ordinarily is, simply to draw a plan of a \$40,000 building; but the important thing to determine was how this should be erected with reference to the White House, so as not to impair the general architectural effect of the building—the terraces and the executive office. It was finally determined that this ought to be built to the south. That requires foundations that would not have been required had it been built as an additional story on top of the present executive offices.

Personally, without claiming to have any artistic taste, I fully agree with the architect that it would be exceedingly unwise to make this building two stories high. I think it would destroy the entire beauty of the combined White House and executive offices, and I think as the architect does, that it ought to be extended to the south, although thereby it will require new foundations and much additional expense to what would have been required had the roof simply been raised and a second story added to the existing building.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are they going to pay him \$3,000 for telling them to build that onto the south of the present building instead of on top of it?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They are going to pay him \$3,000 for the plans, the regular rates charged by architects, but they also needed an architect in order to know where and how the additions should be made to the building, so as not to destroy that magnificent structure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you think the architect exhibited any taste when he put up the building that is down there now?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I do not—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with you.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is, if you refer to the executive offices, I do not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I refer to the executive offices. Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I think the White House is one of the most beautiful buildings in the world.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but the architect who planned that is dead.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I know he is.

Mr. BURLESON. I understand that this extension is practically a restoration of the original plan.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the original plan has been very well carried out or not.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does the Architect of the Treasury do anyhow?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. He draws the plans and superintends the construction of buildings erected by the Treasury Department.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If that is so, what is the reason he can not draw the plans for this building?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Because this is not being built by the Treasury Department, and there was no act of Congress authorizing or directing him to do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Could you not borrow him for a while?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It could be done, but it was not done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did you not authorize the borrowing of him?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Because there was doubt whether he was the proper man to do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why does he not get up plans for all these public buildings that the country is waiting for, and the building of which is delayed?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. That is his business, and the very fact of the delays is the very best proof that he ought not to be asked to do this, because he is too busy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It is not necessarily proof of the fact that he is too busy. It may be he is doing nothing.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. He is busy.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that the cost of the plans prepared by the Supervising Architect is now a little over 6 per cent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question: You say that the architects get 6 per cent, and this thing they are going to build down there is going to cost \$34,500?

Mr. TAWNEY. Fifty-three thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is counting in the furniture; you do not need an architect to buy furniture. Six per cent of \$34,500 would be \$2,070, and here you give him \$3,000.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does the gentleman from Missouri mean to say that the heating and ventilating system is no part of the building?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; you will have another fellow do that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman says that the architect has nothing to do with the ventilating system?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not think he has.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am heartily in favor of this appropriation, because, in my judgment—and I believe it is the judgment of all the Members of the House who know conditions down there—any change in the executive offices would be an improvement of these conditions.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is all true. Let me ask the gentleman from Missouri a question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In one moment. I first want to correct a misunderstanding that might be created by what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has said. He says that the Supervising Architect makes the plans for the buildings for the Treasury Department only. That is not true. In the absence of a depart-

ment of public works the Treasury Department takes the place of—

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Not with reference to this building.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The Supervising Architect is the architect who should be intrusted with the drafting of all the plans for all construction work of the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does the gentleman mean that he should be or that by law he is intrusted with it? Does the gentleman say that he is in charge and furnishes plans of all the buildings in Washington?

Mr. MANN. Like the House Office Building, for instance. He had no more to do with that than the gentleman from Missouri; and not so much, because he had nothing to do with it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The duties of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department are entirely in the discretion of Congress. If Congress says that a building shall be intrusted to the hands of any other architect, of course Congress can do so. But I say as a matter of principle there ought to be one official, one architect, charged with the supervision of all public buildings.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman claims that he ought to be, but not that he is.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. That would be in the interest of economy. And, by the way, the Supervising Architect does not only erect post-office buildings and treasury buildings, but he erects all kinds of buildings for other departments.

Mr. MANN. Does he erect light-house buildings?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. He ought to, if he does not.

Mr. MANN. So he does not even erect all the buildings under the Treasury Department. All he supervises are post-offices and custom-house buildings.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The law especially provides for the Supervising Architect, and when Congress provides that any other architect shall furnish plans, of course it has that right.

Mr. MANN. Congress provides for light-houses and life-saving stations, and does not provide that they shall be erected by some one else, and yet the Supervising Architect has no more supervision over them than the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I hope the time will come, and I am sure the House will agree with me when that subject is perfectly understood, that there will only be one official charged with all the construction work of the Government. That official should have a force sufficient to do all that work, so that it will be unnecessary in the future to employ private architects. As to the charge that there are no men competent enough to erect any kind of public buildings in the architect's office, I believe there are architects now employed in the Supervising Architect's office that are the peers of any private architects in the country. It is true that they work at a small salary, such as our poor Government can afford to give them, but I am personally aware that they are equal to any other talent that may be secured in the country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why is it that the Supervising Architect's department is so far behind in the post-office buildings?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Because we did not give them space enough to locate a sufficient force of draftsmen. We have been in the habit of employing from 70 to 80 draftsmen in the service of the Treasury Department, and when the last two public-buildings bills were passed—one in the last Congress and one in the Congress before, which was unusual—the architect increased his force of draftsmen to about 200, and a larger force can not be employed because of a lack of space. Even the present force is not sufficient to cope with the tremendous work which Congress has thrown upon that office, but very good and rapid progress is being made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, one other question. Does the gentleman think that \$53,000 is necessary to build six rooms down there on the White House grounds?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have not gone into that question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But the gentleman is an expert in the building business and chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the committee of which I have had the honor to be a member had had charge of it, I am sure that I would be competent to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I move, then, Mr. Chairman, that the matter be turned over to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, no. I want this improvement made now, and I am satisfied with the terms of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What does the gentleman say about \$65,000 being spent on that thing that is down there now—as an expert?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, I suppose the job was worth it. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pro forma amendment is exhausted.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair referred only to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. COX of Indiana. As I understand the Chair, the amendment to strike out is still pending?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is pending; and the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to address the committee upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], as well as upon certain other sections of the pending bill.

From my place in the Chamber, I could not hear the information given to the House by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TAWNEY], and I desire to elicit information from him upon the measure under consideration. Did I understand him to state that the Committee on Appropriations had not had an estimate of the cost of this building?

Mr. TAWNEY. The appropriation made in the sundry civil bill at the last session of Congress was not made upon any estimate. It was made because of the necessity of enlarging the building, and was made without an estimate because there was no time to obtain an estimate before the adjournment of Congress on the 4th day of March.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Then, as I understand the gentleman, up until this time the Committee on Appropriations has never taken or heard any evidence as to the estimates?

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, yes; up to this time we have had evidence. The plans have been prepared, the plans for the extension and enlargement of the building, and they have been approved by the President in accordance with the law.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Why was not the full amount of the appropriation made at the last session of Congress?

Mr. TAWNEY. Because we did not know how much would be required.

Mr. COX of Indiana. When did the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations learn that fact for the first time?

Mr. TAWNEY. He learned it for the first time after the plans and specifications were prepared. We had no opportunity to get that information before agreeing in conference to the amendment of the Senate appropriating \$40,000 for this purpose, and it was stated at that time that the amount might have to be enlarged somewhat, and we did not want to make it any larger than we thought absolutely necessary. The chief engineer has said to me, and in the hearings, that they have endeavored to keep down the cost as much as they possibly could; but in view of the fact that they are required under the law to not only complete the building, but to equip it and furnish it, there is no expenditure connected with the building to be made after this expenditure has been made. This is to complete the building and to furnish it and to equip it with all of the appliances necessary to its use.

Mr. COX of Indiana. For \$60,000?

Mr. TAWNEY. Fifty-three thousand five hundred dollars.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I desire not only to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to strike out the paragraph under consideration, but to oppose several other portions of the bill. The bill is an urgent deficiency bill appropriating for deficiencies for the current year ending June 30, 1910, the sum of \$434,401.58. The first session of the Sixtieth Congress appropriated the enormous sum of \$1,008,397,543.56 to meet the expenses of the Government ending June 30, 1909; and the second session of the Sixtieth Congress, ending March 4, last, appropriated the appalling sum of \$1,044,401,857.12 to meet the current expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1910, making a total sum appropriated by the Sixtieth Congress of \$2,052,799,400.68 for the purpose of meeting the current expenses of the Government for two years.

Mr. Chairman, never in the history of the Government has such an era of wild extravagance of the people's money been witnessed as has been in the past two years. Mr. Chairman, when President Taft was inaugurated the people for the time being sighed a breath of relief, believing that economy and not the "big stick" was to be the watchword of his administration. The newspapers throughout the country teemed with editorials announcing the fact that economy would be rigidly practiced in all the departments of the Government under the régime of the present administration; and this announcement was indeed hailed with delight by the people throughout the length and breadth of the land. But if the future is to be governed by the present, I fear that it was a promise made



to be broken on the first occasion. The Congress has been in session since the 15th of last March, not only attempting to revise the tariff, but devising some other system of taxation other than the system now in force whereby revenue may be raised to meet the constant growing appropriations of the people's money. Instead of devising different systems of taxation for the purpose of taking more money in the way of taxes from the people, in my judgment it would be much wiser for not only the President, but Congress as well, to devise a system of reducing the expenditures of the Government to a sound and sane basis. Mr. Chairman, I find the following item in the bill now under consideration:

For traveling expenses of the President of the United States, to continue available during the fiscal year 1910, and to be expended in his discretion and accounted for on his certificate solely, \$25,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed a remarkable request of the President, especially in view of the proceedings had in this Chamber on the closing days of the last Congress. The salary of the President was fixed in 1789 at \$25,000 per annum. It remained at this figure until 1872, when it was increased to \$50,000 per year. This continued to be the salary of the President until the 3d day of March, 1909, when the salary was increased to \$75,000 per year. Mr. Chairman, no one who heard the debates upon this question then and no one who has since read the record of the debates can come to any conclusion other than that the amount of \$75,000 should be in full, not only for the President's salary, but likewise in lieu of his traveling expenses. When the legislative bill came back from the Senate on the 24th of last February, it contained a provision increasing the President's salary from \$50,000 to \$100,000 per annum. This Senate amendment was defeated in the House on a yea-and-nay vote. Mr. Watson, then a Member of Congress from the State of Indiana, moved that the House concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment increasing the President's salary to \$75,000 per annum. In order that no mistake or misunderstanding should thereafter be involved as to the President's salary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANX] offered an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Watson, which amendment is as follows:

Which amount shall cover all transportation expenses now otherwise provided for by law.

So the amendment offered by Mr. Watson, of Indiana, as finally voted upon by the House, was as follows:

This sum to include transportation expenses now otherwise provided for by law; and after the 3d of March, 1909, the compensation of the President of the United States shall be \$75,000 per annum.

The amendment as finally voted upon by the House, found on page 3097 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is as follows:

Page 37, line 14, after "dollars," insert "this sum to include all transportation expenses now otherwise provided for by law; and after the 3d of March, 1909, the compensation of the President of the United States shall be \$75,000, which amount shall cover all transportation expenses now otherwise provided by law."

Mr. Chairman, English language could not be any plainer than this. It meant and was understood to mean, not only by the Members of the House, but, in my judgment, by the country as well, that this \$75,000 per year should cover not only the salary of the President but his transportation expenses as well; but Mr. Chairman, the very first thing at this special session of Congress it is asked to make an appropriation of \$25,000 to pay the traveling expenses of the President for the current year ending June 30, 1910. It is true that in 1906 Congress passed a law thereafter empowering it to make appropriations to cover the traveling expenses of the President, and while I concede that Congress can not repeal a general statute by an appropriation bill, yet I insist that, while the last Congress did not legally repeal the general statute passed by it in 1906 giving to Congress the power to appropriate money to defray the traveling expenses of the President, at least the last session of Congress morally repealed the act of 1906 when it increased the salary of the President from \$50,000 per annum to \$75,000.

It is not the paltry sum of \$25,000 against which I inveigh this evening, but it is the principle involved in it. It is the question of keeping faith with the people and the people's money, for whom we are asked to appropriate it. The President, being the head of the Nation, should practice what he preaches and, when he insists that economy shall be practiced not only by Congress in the way of making appropriations, but in all the departments of the Government, he should put into effect the doctrine which he has proclaimed and which the people so eagerly hailed. We are promised a reduction to the extent of not less than \$10,000,000 per year in the navy, and not less than \$20,000,000 in the army, together with a corresponding reduction in all the departments of the Government, so as to bring the Government's expenses within the legitimate power of the Government to raise revenue to meet its expenses. But if this appropriation bill is to be any guideboard by which

appropriations can be measured in the future, before the Sixty-first Congress closes I very much fear that we will see the appropriations far above the amount of money appropriated by the Sixtieth Congress.

The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill passed by the last Congress covering expenses for the executive department for the year 1910 contains the following items:

For compensation of the President of the United States, \$75,000, and after the 3d of March, 1909, the compensation of the President of the United States shall be \$75,000 per annum; a sufficient sum to pay the increase in the compensation of the President herein authorized from March 4 to June 30, 1909, inclusive, is hereby appropriated. For compensation to the following in the office of the President of the United States: Secretary, \$6,000; 2 assistant secretaries, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,500; executive clerk and disbursing officer, \$2,000; 7 clerks, at \$2,000 each; 1 clerk of class 4; 1 clerk of class 4, who shall be a telegrapher; 4 clerks of class 3; 2 clerks of class 2; steward, \$1,800; chief doorkeeper, \$1,800; 5 doorkeepers, at \$1,400 each; 3 doorkeepers, at \$1,200 each; 4 messengers, at \$1,200 each; 5 messengers, at \$900 each; watchman, \$900; 1 fireman, \$900; laborer, \$720; laborer, \$600; in all, \$69,920.

For contingent expenses of the executive office, including stationery therefor, as well as record books, telegrams, telephones, books for library, furniture and carpets for offices, horses, carriages, harness, automobiles, expenses of stable, including labor and miscellaneous items, to be expended in the discretion of the President, \$25,000.

Mr. Chairman, these items do not include the total cost of maintaining the executive office of the United States. At the last session of Congress, Mr. HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I adopt, showing that the expense of the executive office amounted to \$269,400 per year. Mr. Chairman, when will this eternal demand for increase of salaries stop? It has come to pass that as soon as a man is elected to office, although knowing at the time just what his salary is, yet he at once determines, upon his election, that his salary is not large enough, and he rushes to Congress or to some other lawmaking body, asking it to increase his salary. This is invariably put upon the ground that the cost of living has largely increased in the last few years, and therefore his salary must be increased in proportion to the increased cost of living, little thinking or reckoning that the cost of living has increased to everyone in the last few years, and little thinking or reckoning that every consumer of commodities in this country will be taxed to pay the everlasting increase of salaries.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this constant, growing demand for increased salary and compensation to officeholders is one of the crowning evils of the present day, and I believe that it is now time that Congress firmly set its face against these demands for increased salary and compensation and turn them down. I know of no law which compels a man to hold an office, and he is at liberty at any time to resign and follow some other vocation in life; and if he finds that his salary is not commensurate with his expense, he can readily resign and retire to private life, where he can follow his own vocation and earn money to meet his increased cost of living. This is practically true of all departments of the Government—a growing demand to increase the salary of the judges of the Supreme Court, together with the various inferior federal courts throughout the United States and that of the Vice-President. "The laborer is worthy of his hire," but he knows what his hire is when he accepts the employment, and he should not ask Congress to continually increase his salary. I am opposed to this everlasting increase in salaries. I think the time has come that the people are opposed to it; and believing as I do, I am unalterably opposed to many if not all of the provisions in the bill now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, it is argued that the social functions of the President are exacting of him and that he must meet them, and therefore he is entitled to not only an increase of salary, but to have his traveling expenses paid as well. Abraham Lincoln served this country as President from 1861 to 1865 upon a salary of \$25,000 per year, and it is useless for me to say that he served his country through one of the most trying ordeals it ever passed; yet if history can be believed, this great commoner, who sprang directly from the loins of the common people and who knew their wants and who was thoroughly conversant with their hardships, saved at least one-half of his salary each year while serving the Government as its Chief Executive. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly with the President in his effort to economize, and will willingly vote for any measure which will reduce the public expenditures of the people's money; but I am opposed to him in the measure now under consideration, as well as many others if not all of the provisions contained in this bill. I sincerely hope that before this bill finally becomes a law its obnoxious features carrying increased salaries and emoluments of office will be defeated.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] a question or two. I have

noticed that gentlemen are referring to printed hearings upon this bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. By what committee?

Mr. TAWNEY. No committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. By what authority?

Mr. TAWNEY. By common consent.

Mr. HARDWICK. Was there any order made here in the House for it?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; there was not.

Mr. HARDWICK. And no provision made for the printing of the document?

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, yes; the hearings were printed under authority of law.

Mr. HARDWICK. Given how and where?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certificate of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Chairman, it looks to me like a somewhat unusual situation—

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say one word in reply to the gentleman—

Mr. HARDWICK. Just a minute; I have the floor.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have the floor. You are asking me some questions.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all. I was recognized in my own right and speak in my own time.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say this: It looks to me like a curious proposition that, with none of the committees appointed, here is a committee that does not legally exist and yet seems to be operating in fact, having hearings, bringing in bills, having printing done, and having different witnesses brought before it, and it looks to me like this whole proceeding is irregular from beginning to end. If there is any necessity for an appropriation committee to discharge its functions regularly, that committee ought to have been appointed by the Speaker of this House, and we ought not to have any such remarkable spectacle as this, of a committee that has no existence in law operating in fact, having hearings and having printing done, and really having no right to do any of it, as I understand the law and the custom of this House, and yet simply takes charge of the situation simply because the Speaker has not seen fit to appoint the committees.

Mr. MADDEN. But the matter is now being submitted to the gentleman and the other members of the committee.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand; but the matter of holding these hearings was not submitted to the House.

Mr. MADDEN. The hearings are.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all. They had no authority or right to hold them.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will say to my colleague that we did that for the accommodation of the House, and without any compensation or reward or hope thereof.

Mr. HARDWICK. I quite understand; but you did it without authority.

Mr. TAWNEY. When the bill appropriating money to continue the Census Office and to provide for the taking of the next census was presented here, I was severely criticised for having brought that bill into the House without any hearings at all. Now, because this bill was necessary, carrying only such items as are necessary and urgent, and because I have for the accommodation of the House had hearings, the gentlemen criticise me again.

Mr. HARDWICK. Not at all. I am not criticising the gentleman so much as I am the way the business of this House has been conducted. What right had the gentleman to have hearings?

Mr. TAWNEY. The same right that the gentleman has, if he can get anybody to come before him.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand; but what authority did the gentleman have to have this printed report made?

Mr. MANN. He takes the chances on paying for them.

Mr. TAWNEY. Under the law which gives to the Clerk of the House of Representatives authority to certify for the printing of any document that he may see fit to certify to up to \$500.

Mr. HARDWICK. You pay for this particular hearing out of that fund, then? I repeat my remark. I do not care anything about the merits of this bill. If it is necessary for this committee to have hearings and bring in bills virtually as a committee bill, it looks to me that the committee ought to have been appointed; and it ought not to have assumed an authority that it never did possess and never has been conferred upon it by competent authority of this House. That is the thing that has impressed me.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I move to strike out the last two words. I want to offer this suggestion. I think this debate has probably served the purpose of the gentlemen who have

participated in it. This item was subject manifestly to a point of order. Any Member who was really opposed to the amendment could have put it out on a point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] is not going to press his amendment to strike out the paragraph, but that he offered the motion in order to elicit information about the provision. I believe there is some justice in the criticism about the amount that it will eventually cost to build a one-story brick building along the simplest lines possible, the dimensions of which will be about 75 by 60 feet. I am quite sure that there are some States that could almost erect a state capitol of much greater magnificence and fully sufficient for all its purposes for almost an equal amount of money. I dislike to delve into the past and refer to what happened when the building was first constructed. No one has ever had the courage in this House to justify the expenditure of almost \$600,000 in the renovation of the White House and about \$60,000 of that amount in the erection of an office building, purposely designed, I have heard it stated, to provide insufficient accommodations for the Members of Congress, in the hope it would keep them away from the President.

I see the gentleman from Illinois shake his head. I wish to say that I had not attributed to him this rumor that has some foundation in fact. A room is set aside for a waiting place for Members of the House and Senate, the dimensions of which are about 10 feet by 20 feet. Those who have necessary business with the President, as well as those who bring their constituents to the White House to meet him, are expected to be crowded into that room like sardines in a box, so that they might catch fleeting glimpses of the President as he passes the door and then go out and not annoy him. The result has been that a room that had been set apart for the business of the Cabinet has necessarily been used as a reception room for Members of Congress. During the consideration of the sundry civil bill in the last session of Congress, I believe it was the Senator from Maine who suggested that there was much propriety in the suggestion that additional accommodations should be afforded at the White House, not only for the transaction of public business, but also for the convenience of Members of Congress. I was one of those who believed that perhaps after the 4th of March last Members of Congress might find it more convenient to loiter about the sacred precincts of the White House. I believed it was desirable to afford them proper shelter and convenience and room there. The \$40,000 was appropriated because it was stated that some investigation had been made, and it was believed that \$40,000 would be sufficient to raise the present building one story and at the same time to treat it in such a manner architecturally that nobody would discover that it had been raised, and so it would not interfere with the architectural features and surroundings of the White House.

It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, although I do not profess to any special knowledge about architecture, that to extend this building 45 feet, a building about 60 feet wide, and to put in it the most simple furnishings costing only \$7,000, that the amount asked would indicate that the man who originally planned the present building must at least have inspired the plan for this additional \$53,000 as the amount to be expended. With the original expenditure, as I have already stated, the building, which is, as stated in the memorandum submitted by the superintendent in charge of the White House, a building in which there is no unnecessary extravagance or elaboration of any kind, about 60 feet by 75, a building of brick, painted white, will have cost the Government of the United States \$150,000. I am not criticising the expenditure. Perhaps it is worth that much money to abolish the tennis court, so that there will be no danger of its being revived at any time in the future with its attendant unofficial advisers attached to it; but it does seem a rather large amount.

I submit to the gentleman from Minnesota that there is a duplication here of the architect's fees. There is a specific provision of \$3,000 for the architect. My understanding is that the architect's fee includes the preparation of plans and all work incident to supervision until the building is turned over to the owners, and yet in addition to the \$3,000 for the architect's fee there is an item of \$3,000 for superintendence and inspection; so that the entire cost for the architect and superintendence, which should be about \$3,000, will be \$6,000, more than 10 per cent of the amount to be expended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to prolong this discussion. I think it is a little unfair for the distinguished gentleman from Indiana to say, as he has just said, the first thing the President did after declaring in favor of economy was to ask an appropriation of \$25,000 for himself for traveling ex-



penses. Nearly three years before President Taft became President—June, 1906—a law was passed by the Congress of the United States providing for that \$25,000 annually, or authorizing the payment of the President's traveling expenses to the extent of \$25,000 per annum. This law was passed just about two years before he was nominated for President, and yet this distinguished gentleman accuses him of getting into office and at once trying to break into the Treasury.

Mr. COX of Indiana. The gentleman does not deny but what President Taft is asking for this appropriation.

Mr. KEIFER. I do not know. But I do know the law of June, 1906, requires us to appropriate that money, and it is unfair to say that he is asking for it. He is entitled to the compensation, salary, emoluments, or whatever it may be named, provided by law prior to entering upon his term of office. His compensation can not be increased or diminished during the period of his term. (Art. II, sec. 1, par. 5, Const. U. S.)

Mr. COX of Indiana. Did you not hear the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations yesterday say that he was asking for it?

Mr. KEIFER. I think not. I do not know anything more than that the law requires us to make this appropriation. The paragraph in the bill is simply to give the President what the existing law requires.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Will the gentleman contend that the organic law is compulsory, to compel Congress to make an appropriation?

Mr. KEIFER. Undoubtedly; because the President is an officer of the Government, and he is entitled to have what is provided for him by law, and, like any other officer, could perhaps compel its payment if so disposed.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman think that we would be violating law if we failed to make that appropriation?

Mr. KEIFER. I do not say that; but I do say it would remain an obligation against the Government if we fail to do our duty.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I will ask the gentleman whether or not it is a fact that the President asked for a provision to be made for an automobile for him even before he was inaugurated as President?

Mr. KEIFER. I do not know anything about that. If he did, it was because one was needed.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Does the gentleman believe that if Congress fails to make this appropriation of \$25,000 we will be derelict in our duty?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to making this appropriation of \$13,500 for the purpose of providing enough money to complete this summer the proposed addition to the last addition to the White House. I shall be glad to do it, although I have always felt ashamed every time I have looked at the White House since it had the shed additions to it. We can travel from here to California and find barns all along the way that are much in appearance like the White House since the shed wings were added to it. The barns were originally built with the expectation that they would be adapted to the needs and uses of the farmer, and afterwards he found that he had to build cow sheds, running up on each side. The White House now looks, with its shed additions, like a huge building more nearly fitted for a barn than for the White House of this great country.

Mr. BUTLER. They call them "lean-to's."

Mr. KEIFER. Yes; they call them "lean-to's" in Pennsylvania. They are not as good as the common old-fashioned lean-to structures. These sheds are built up as we have seen them on buildings in which farmers house their cattle, horses, and jacks, or whatever else they want to get in dry. [Laughter.]

There ought to have been erected a new modern residence house for the President and his family to occupy, and the White House should have been left in its grandeur and beauty without architectural change. Now, it seems that the appropriation of \$40,000 already made for the further addition was supposed to be all that would be necessary to complete it, and it now turns out that unless we make a further appropriation of \$13,500 the building can not be suitably constructed this summer. Notwithstanding what I have said, I favor this further appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I renew it, simply for the purpose of making one observation, called for partly by the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio and partly by the remarks of others in the same line.

When the White House was first reconstructed, having, like the other gentlemen in the House here who have been express-

ing their opinions, no knowledge of architecture and little conception of art, I felt as they do in relation to this rehabilitation of the White House, but as time has gone on the calm simplicity of the White House, its wings and the office building, have impressed me as the only proper method of extending the White House; and while gentlemen here have delighted for years to abuse the executive office building and the wings of the White House, no one has ever yet suggested any method by which the White House could have been extended and preserve the original simplicity of the White House itself except the method adopted by probably the best architect in the country, under the direction of President Roosevelt.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment to strike out the section.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To pay the claim of Marcus Ramadanovitch, alias Radich, a Montenegrin subject, for property stated to have been appropriated by the United States military authorities in Texas during the month of October, 1865, \$6,396.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment—

Mr. MANN. I make a point of order.

Mr. MACON. I make a point of order against the provision just read.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen from Arkansas, Illinois, and Tennessee make points of order against the paragraph just read.

Mr. TAWNEY. My amendment is to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not in order with the point of order pending.

Mr. MACON. I make the point of order against it, and I should like to be heard upon the point, if the Chair is in doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the attitude of the gentleman from Minnesota, the Chair assumes that he does not oppose the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is a question about its being subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have an amendment to strike out the paragraph, and I should like the privilege of stating to the House why I do so.

Mr. MACON. Let it go out on the point of order, and then the gentleman can offer his amendment.

Mr. TAWNEY. The point of order having been sustained, that disposes of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the United States to accept the invitation extended by the Government of Belgium and to participate, through a commission consisting of not more than one person, to be appointed by the President, in the exposition to be held at Brussels in 1910, and to make such an exhibit at such exposition as will, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, best serve to illustrate some of the principal activities of the Government of the United States, \$30,000. The commissioner herein authorized may receive, out of the sum herein appropriated, compensation at the rate of \$3,000 per annum, together with his actual and necessary expenses. Nothing in this provision shall be construed so as to create any liability upon the part of the United States, directly or indirectly, for any debt or obligation incurred, or for any claim for aid or pecuniary assistance from Congress or the Treasury of the United States in support or liquidation of any debts or obligations that may be created on account of said exhibit and participation in said exposition beyond the sum hereby appropriated. The Secretary of State shall submit to the present Congress, at its last session, a detailed statement of all expenditures made hereunder.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the provision just read.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman withhold his point of order just a moment? I should like to make a statement in regard to it.

Mr. MACON. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States regarded our participation in the Belgian exposition, to be held in 1910, of such importance that he has made this participation the subject of a special message to Congress.

The exposition held at St. Louis in 1903 was participated in by Belgium to the extent of \$300,000. She proposes to hold an exposition next year, which is to be an international exposition. She has extended to our Government an invitation to participate in the same; and I think if we authorize that participation and restrict it, as we have done in this provision, to an exhibit of such of the activities of the Government as in the judgment

of the Secretary of State should be made, and limit the expenditure for that purpose to \$30,000, we are doing no more than we ought to, out of courtesy to a foreign nation that did us the courtesy to accept our invitation and participate in the world's exposition at St. Louis.

I trust that the gentleman from Arkansas will not insist upon his point of order, for the reason I have stated.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I had the honor of sitting with the Ways and Means Committee to take evidence on the tariff bill now in the hands of the so-called "conference committee."

Before that committee every manufacturer in the United States displayed absolute fear, almost to the extent of withdrawing from the room and hiding himself whenever the word "Belgium" was mentioned. I do not believe that if this entire appropriation was made for the Belgian exposition that any manufacturer in the United States could be persuaded to go there without an armed guard of marines. [Laughter.] Therefore it is useless to make it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Georgia that this is not for the purpose of enabling American manufacturers to exhibit their goods at this Belgian exposition, that already all the space available or that can be obtained from the exposition officials has been allotted to American exhibitors.

Mr. MACON. At whose request was the allotment made?

Mr. TAWNEY. At the request of the representative of the American exhibitors.

Mr. MACON. Was not it at the request of Professor Gore?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; who represents the American exhibitors.

Mr. MACON. At the instance of Professor Gore, the exposition expert that does nothing in God's world for a living but get up these exhibitions in order that he can act as commissioner at them for a good round price. We would not care how often they were held or how much they cost so he received his pay as commissioner. He is a professional at the business.

Mr. TAWNEY. The money is not to be expended in utilizing any of this space that has been obtained by Professor Gore.

Mr. MACON. According to the hearings, Professor Gore is strictly in the exhibition business, and the space was reserved at his request.

Mr. TAWNEY. Professor Gore was interrogated for the purpose of ascertaining the extent and character of the exposition, and to determine also whether or not the Government should participate in it as a government.

Mr. MACON. Professor Gore stated further that the manufacturers of this country said that they were so busy with their domestic trade that they did not have time to pay any attention to foreign business, and that they did not expect to make any exhibits at this exposition.

Mr. TAWNEY. I concede that. This appropriation has no relation to the exhibitors that may exhibit their wares at this exhibition. This is simply a governmental matter, and the language is so worded that not a dollar of it can be expended to aid any citizen in making an exhibit at Belgium.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me, I want to say that, from my understanding of the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, every manufacturer expressed a fear of letting the Belgians or the Germans know anything about what they were manufacturing here. They say they are coming here and inspecting our goods and our machinery and going home and making them cheaper and better and sending them back here and selling them in competition with us and at a cheaper price.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Does the gentleman from Georgia recollect that when he was pursuing his investigations we found that the balance of trade was enormously in favor of the United States and against Belgium, and that Belgium was one of the best customers the United States had in the world?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes; but our manufacturers are all in fear of them.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Chairman, is not this discussion confined to the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved by the gentleman from Arkansas at the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply wanted to make a statement here as to why the provision was in the bill and why, in the judgment of those that prepared the bill, the Government should as a matter of courtesy accept the invitation of Belgium to participate in the exposition. If the gentleman from Arkansas wishes to insist on his point of order, he can.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question. Is not the exhibition business a sort of industry in Belgium, a kind of institution that they

have one year in Antwerp and two or three years afterwards in Brussels?

Mr. TAWNEY. This is the third exposition they have had within the last fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A money-making scheme, is it not?

Mr. TAWNEY. My information is that the exhibition is held under the authority of the Belgian Government, but controlled by a local corporation under charter from the Government.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is it not true that it is a business venture and that they make 12 per cent?

Mr. TAWNEY. I am told that the corporation holding the exposition has never made less than 12 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota whether Belgium is being given any more space than they occupied at the St. Louis exposition?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; this participation is just 10 per cent of the participation that Belgium had in the St. Louis exposition.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, at the last session of Congress there was a bill, which I believe was a Senate bill, having passed the Senate, which came to the House and was reported favorably to the House by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, providing for an appropriation for this exposition. My recollection is—possibly it may be erroneous—that that bill carried \$300,000.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; it did.

Mr. MANN. It was brought up under suspension of the rules, during the closing hours of the session, one evening. Like some other bills, it had attracted my casual attention, and I called the attention of the House to its provisions, under a demand for a second, and the bill was rejected. That bill carried \$300,000, and provided a very pleasant junketing trip for various gentlemen who were to be or were then connected with the Congress and other departments of the Government. It seemed to me very improper to make that appropriation at the time and to pass that bill. Here, however, is a proposition to appropriate \$30,000, one-tenth of the sum originally proposed, for the purpose of merely having this Government represented at an exposition upon the invitation of a foreign government which is our friend and which has been represented at the numerous expositions in our country. The President, who conducts our affairs with foreign countries, is of the official and personal opinion that it is desirable for us to take this much part in the exposition in Belgium and to provide to this extent for participation in that exposition. It seems to me, under these circumstances, with no proposition such as was provided in the original bill or original scheme—which, I take it, is the one referred to by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON]—merely to accept the invitation of a foreign country in a polite way, to return, as it were, the wedding presents which we received when we held our affairs, that it is one of those courtesies which occur between nations as they do between individuals, and that the invitation ought to be accepted. We can not stand in the position of being the recipients of presents all of the time and never returning them. [Applause.]

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say, in reply to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, that we have participated in as many expositions in Belgium as Belgium has participated in in the United States. I want to say, sir, that Belgium has had more expositions, perhaps, than any other country on the globe, and that they have gone into the exposition business as a money-making proposition, and that they have them every few years. I find in the hearings that they had an exposition at Antwerp in 1884, one at Brussels in 1888, another at Antwerp in 1894, another at Brussels in 1897, one at Liege in 1905, and now they are going to have another in Brussels in 1910, just five years after the last one. If we are to appropriate the money of the people of this country to participate in nothing else except the expositions in Belgium, if we show a willingness to appropriate largely for purposes of that kind, those appropriations alone in a few years will burden our Government more heavily than I can estimate. I am opposed to shows of this kind in this country or abroad, and under no circumstances, while I am a Member of the House, will I ever suffer a proposition of this kind to be enacted into law if my humble vote will prevent it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to pay rent for vault space in the Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., for the safe-keeping of emergency currency notes prepared under the provisions of "An act to amend the national banking laws," approved May 30, 1908, and for incidental expenses connected therewith, \$4,630.70.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill with reference to that appropria-



tion. Is this to be an annual payment to the Union Trust Company for the custody of these notes? What was the evidence before the committee?

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, when the bill became a law authorizing the issue of the emergency currency, an appropriation was made for the purpose of erecting new vaults in the Treasury building in the city here. There was no place to store this money while the Bureau of Printing and Engraving was manufacturing it. They were obliged to rent vault space in the Union Trust Building. These vaults in the Treasury building are now completed and all of the money of this emergency currency is now stored in the Treasury. This is to pay the rent which they were not authorized to pay under existing law. Otherwise it would have been paid. They had the appropriation, but they had no authority under the emergency act to rent any buildings or any space for the use of the Treasury Department.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this currency was not completed currency at the time it was stored there?

Mr. TAWNEY. Oh, no.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Can the gentleman tell me how much the printing and engraving work on this emergency currency has cost up to date?

Mr. TAWNEY. I can not. If the gentleman will call in my committee room, I can give him some information. If he will take the hearings on the last sundry civil appropriation bill, I think he will get the information there.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. Does it come up to nearly a million dollars?

Mr. TAWNEY. I would not want to say, because I have not attempted to carry the amount in my mind. If the gentleman will examine the hearings on the sundry civil appropriation bill in the last session of Congress, I think he will get the information he is after.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question or two. This emergency currency is a kind of "phony" money, is it not?

Mr. TAWNEY. Kind of what?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. "Phony" money, as they call it on the street.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman may place his own construction—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Stage money.

Mr. TAWNEY. He can place his own construction and give it any title he desires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Nobody has used any of it, have they?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not that I know of.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Here is the question I really wanted to ask you: What is the reason the United States Government does not build all the buildings in the city of Washington that it needs, and why is this eternal renting of buildings going on here? The Government can borrow money cheaper than anybody else on earth can borrow it, and here we are paying rent that amounts to 10 per cent.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not enunciate that doctrine, because if he does we never can satisfy the people about the amount of buildings—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What people?

Mr. MANN. In the departments, I mean.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to say for the information of the gentleman from Missouri that in the last Congress the Committee on Appropriations recommended to the House an appropriation of over \$2,000,000, or about \$2,000,000, for the erection of a building to accommodate the Geological Survey, Land Office, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, but Congress would not accept it. I can not tell the gentleman why we have not built buildings sufficient to accommodate the needs of the Government here in Washington, except that Congress will not authorize their construction and appropriate the money.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you not think it would be a wise thing to do to save this rent?

Mr. TAWNEY. I thought so when I reported the sundry civil bill with that provision appropriating \$2,000,000, but my associates in Congress did not agree with me.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why did not you get the Committee on Rules to bring in a rule and pass it?

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question—

Mr. TAWNEY. About the Tombigbee?

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman a question. I want to ask the gentleman if he can inform us how much we are paying for rent for public buildings in the city of Washington?

Mr. TAWNEY. About \$450,000 for rents in the city of Washington.

Mr. CANDLER. What per cent is that upon the valuation of buildings, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman can get the valuation and figure it out himself. I am not enough of a mathematician. I do not know what the valuation of the buildings is.

Mr. CANDLER. I thought as the gentleman was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he was, of course, a mathematician.

The Clerk read as follows:

For balance of salary of the Treasurer of the United States as provided by law, from March 4, 1909, to June 30, 1910, both dates inclusive, for the fiscal years as follows—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Lines 1 to 6?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Lines 1 to 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That it changes existing law.

Mr. TAWNEY. What is the basis of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition seems to the Chair to be from lines 1 to 8.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If that is to be considered as one paragraph; but the Clerk has only read the first paragraph. I have no objection to considering lines 1 to 8 as one paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. I think the gentleman, if he wants to make the point of order, ought to make it in its entirety and take in the whole paragraph.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Lines 1 to 8.

Mr. TAWNEY. Lines 1 to 8.

The CHAIRMAN. By consent of the committee, the gentleman can reserve his point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. I ask unanimous consent that lines 1 to 8 be considered as a single paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the fiscal year 1909, \$650.

For the fiscal year 1910, \$2,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is a change of existing law. I understand the situation to be this, that the salary of the Treasurer of the United States has been \$6,000, and for the fiscal year 1909, \$6,000 was appropriated. For the fiscal year 1910, \$6,000 was appropriated. On the 4th of March in a bill raising the salaries of customs inspectors and employees a provision was inserted raising the salary of the Treasurer of the United States to \$8,000. Of course, that does not affect the situation here. Many salaries are fixed at a certain amount which Congress does not appropriate. If we are to initiate the practice now of bringing in items as deficiencies to make good the difference between the amount appropriated and the amount fixed by law, there will be no end of deficiencies for this purpose. In the legislative act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, which goes into effect on the 1st of July, 1909, appropriation of the \$6,000 for salary is in full compensation for all services rendered by any official appropriated for.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that an appropriation was made for the salary of this official for the year 1909, and after that appropriation was made Congress passed an act which provided for an increase of the salary from the date of that act?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now, does the gentleman question that a parliamentary proposition, not only in order, but the duty—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Not only question it, but I am absolutely sure, since the committee consented to consider as one paragraph that item and the next, which is an appropriation for \$2,000 for the alleged balance for the present fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Whether or not it ought to be paid, is it not clear that it is a deficiency? If after an appropriation is made for a particular purpose Congress authorizes an additional amount in law, certainly that creates a deficiency which belongs in a deficiency appropriation bill. Of course I do not say that Congress had—

Mr. FITZGERALD. The 1st of July, 1909, to the 30th of June, 1910, the appropriation of \$6,000 was in full for the services appropriated for.

Mr. MANN. Very well. He has not accepted that money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But he has rendered the service.

Mr. MANN. Not for 1910. Now, for 1909, after that law went into effect requiring him to accept this money in full,

Congress increased his compensation, and that repealed that law so far as he was concerned.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The unfortunate part of that situation is this—that no attempt was made to protect that part of the appropriation, and as an appropriation which might have been in order is associated with one which clearly is not in order, both must go out of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Both of those items are clearly in order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Both are not in order, in my opinion.

Mr. MANN. The item for 1909 is a clear deficiency, created by act of Congress after the appropriation law was passed. The item for 1910 is a clear deficiency, created by act of Congress.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. Certainly. He has not accepted any money.

Mr. FITZGERALD. After the Congress fixed the salary at \$8,000, it passed an act which went into effect—

Mr. MANN. Not after; but even if it had been after, it would not have made any difference, because he had not gotten any of that money yet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But he had entered upon the service. The appropriation is in full for his service during that year.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman will admit that if this official was serving under an appropriation limiting his salary to \$4,000, stating, if accepted, it should be in full, he is not obliged to accept any salary at all, but can go into the Court of Claims at the end of the year's term and obtain the allowance of his salary in full as allowed by the law. The item in the appropriation bill said that he accepts the salary in full, and it does not repeal the law. It only estops him from asking anything more if he does not accept it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, I think the construction would be the same as upon the repealing law.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman this: The gentleman says this salary was increased in a bill increasing the salaries of custom-house officials. I was familiar with it as to certain custom-house officials. I did not know that it increased the salary of the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Neither did I.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that there was anything surreptitious in any way in getting that in that bill? Where was it put in?

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Illinois did not know it was in, a doubt is necessarily raised in my mind as to whether it was put in surreptitiously; because, with the vigilance with which he keeps track of the proceedings of the House, it would not have been possible for the item to have been in the bill with his knowledge. I do not know when or where it was put in.

But I do know that a bill was introduced for the purpose of increasing the salaries of some of the customs employees. One of the last things I find in that act is a provision that "hereafter the compensation of the Treasurer of the United States shall be \$8,000." I do not know whether that was in the bill when it passed the House. I know it was never discussed. I am quite confident that this particular item in the shape in which it is presented is subject to the point of order. In the District of Columbia, for instance, we have various judicial officials whose salaries are fixed by the District Code at a certain amount, but Congress has never appropriated that sum. There are a number of other officials whose salaries are fixed at a certain amount, but Congress does not appropriate the amount fixed in the statute. I do not think it is a wise thing to commence at this time to consider as a deficiency the difference between the amount fixed by statute and the amount Congress appropriates for the service, and to carry it in a deficiency bill. If that practice be initiated, the deficiencies will overwhelm this Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me? Does the gentleman contend that when a salary is increased by a substantive act of legislation that the occupant of the office has not a claim for the full amount of the salary?

Mr. FITZGERALD. He is entitled to the amount Congress appropriates for his service, particularly when there is in the act a provision that that is in full compensation for his service. If he is not satisfied with the compensation, if he thinks he is not receiving what he should receive, I am sure there are any number of gentlemen on that side who could suggest an applicant for the position who would fill it efficiently.

Mr. STAFFORD. Just as soon as the act is passed increasing the salary it repeals the saving clause of your act, which says that the amount appropriated shall be in full.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It may have repealed the saving clause of the act of 1909, but it does not repeal the act of 1910.

Mr. TAWNEY. Why does it not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Because that went into effect later than that.

Mr. TAWNEY. How do you know that is a fact? They were both sent to the President the same day and they were signed the same day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appropriation commenced at the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. The presumption would be in favor of repealing that restriction.

Mr. TAWNEY. Section 7 of that act provides that "hereafter the compensation of the Treasurer of the United States shall be \$8,000," and section 8 provides that "all acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are repealed." That act was approved March 4, 1909.

Mr. FITZGERALD. A great many things were approved on March 4, 1909, that did not meet with the commendation of the gentleman from Minnesota any more than with my own. I do not think we can be held responsible for anything that was approved on that date. The legislative act was approved the 4th of March, 1908, and it provides that—

Mr. TAWNEY. So was the act increasing the compensation of the Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me read. The gentleman has read that section of the act increasing the salaries, which provides that all acts inconsistent with that act are repealed. The legislative act for the fiscal year 1910 was approved March 4, 1909. It provides that the "following sums appropriated in full compensation for services of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910," including \$6,000 to the Treasurer of the United States. The last section, 5, of that act also provides that "all laws or parts of law inconsistent with that law are hereby repealed." So that I insist that this repealing provision applies as much to the act the gentleman has cited as the provision he cites applies to the act which I have in my hand. The fact is that the intent of Congress is clear—to provide \$6,000 as the compensation of this office.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule if the gentleman has concluded his argument. The Chair does not wish to intimate in advance what his conclusion is.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have said all I wish to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, contained a provision that the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, and so forth, in full compensation for the services for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and fixed \$6,000 for the Treasurer of the United States. That act was approved in 1908. March 4, 1909, an act was passed fixing the compensation of the Treasurer of the United States at \$8,000 per annum, and repealing all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this provision. It seems clear to the present occupant of the chair that the provisions of this act changed the provisions of the act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, and that the Treasurer of the United States would clearly be entitled to receive the difference in the rate of compensation for the period between March 4, 1909, and the end of the fiscal year.

Now, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the current fiscal year contained the same provision about the amount appropriated being in full compensation for services for the fiscal year, and this act was approved on the same day as the act changing the salary of the Treasurer of the United States.

If the provision of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill changes the law as to the salary of the Treasurer of the United States, it would seem to the present occupant of the chair that there could be no presumption in favor of the official; but it has been repeatedly declared, and in a case laid before the present occupant of the chair, decided by Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE in the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress (pp. 2009-2019), quoted on page 450 of volume 4 of Hinds' Precedents, it is stated, that the words "in full compensation for services for the fiscal year" do not change the law, but if the official concludes not to accept the salary appropriated he has the legal right to go into the Court of Claims and recover the full amount of the salary which the law specifies.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But there is a provision in the legislative act repealing all acts inconsistent with that law. Section 5 of the legislative act has the provision that all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with this act are repealed, and the Chair can not overlook that provision in considering the effect of the first part of the act.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it seems that the error of the gentleman from New York is just in this: Where the law fixes a salary, Congress can refuse to appropriate any of it. The man may hold the office and perform the functions of the office. Con-



gress may refuse to appropriate any of the salary. In such case the officeholder can go into the Court of Claims and obtain a judgment for the amount of the salary fixed by law. Now, Congress, having the right to withhold all of the salary, may withhold a portion of the salary. It may provide that that portion shall be in full compensation, and if the man accepts the salary, then he takes it in full compensation. If he does not accept the salary, he can go into the Court of Claims and recover the amount of salary fixed by law. So that the provision in the legislative bill, repealing all laws in conflict, does not repeal this provision in the special act, because it is not in conflict with the law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It repeals the law that provides that any other sum than the amount appropriated shall be the compensation.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman would not claim for a moment that Congress by law can repeal a law for a year and then have it in force again at the end of that year unless it specifically so provides.

The provision in the appropriation bill stating that \$6,000 shall be full compensation for the year only applies to the fiscal year; and the gentleman himself will not claim that the real law in conflict with the appropriation for the year is repealed under the repealing clause, because that provision of the appropriation act is only in force for a year at best.

The CHAIRMAN. Section 5 of the legislative act, repealing all laws or parts of law inconsistent with this provision, seems to the present occupant of the chair not to be held to repeal the provisions of Public Act No. 343, fixing the salary of the Treasurer of the United States. It relates to appropriations, and not to fixing the salaries; and if, while the current fiscal year run along, the Treasurer drew his salary under the provisions of that legislation, he would be barred from going into the Court of Claims to recover any balance of salary; yet it does not seem as if the provisions of the act of March 4, 1909, so far as anything appears to the committee, have been in anywise affected, and the Chair overrules the point of order and holds that the appropriation is in order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

For such repairs, alterations, and other work incident thereto, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, as may be necessary to properly adapt the fourth floor of the Treasury building, on the south and west sides, to the use and accommodation of the Office of the Supervising Architect, and such other alterations and rearrangement of the Treasury building as the needs of the department may require, \$40,000.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I wish the gentleman would withhold it for a moment.

Mr. MACON. I have reserved the point of order, not made it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon it. These alterations are going on now. They have become necessary because of the fact that the space now occupied by the Supervising Architect is needed for other offices, and this space can be secured on the fourth floor of the Treasury building, which was previously occupied by offices removed to the Government Printing Office. The change was deemed desirable, and I wish to make these remarks in connection with the changes. They are necessary in order to secure a location for the Supervising Architect to enable that official to go ahead with his work, and it is necessary that these appropriations should be made. But I desire to express the hope now that at some day this House will see the necessity of making an appropriation large enough to secure a special and separate building for that great workshop.

As has been stated in this debate heretofore, the work on the public buildings, for which the people are waiting all over the country, has been delayed because of the lack of space for the Supervising Architect. In other words, there was a limit on account of the lack of space to the employment of draftsmen who were necessary to prepare plans for our public buildings. If the policy—which I hope will be adopted in the near future—of consolidating all the construction work of the Government under one head is to be carried out, I hope we will make an appropriation large enough to secure a separate building for the Supervising Architect, and thus enable him to employ sufficient help to more expeditiously carry out the acts of Congress providing for new public buildings.

Mr. MACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. MACON. I want to ask the gentleman if the changes that this appropriation seeks to have made in the Treasury building are not to accommodate somebody else rather than the Supervising Architect?

Mr. TAWNEY. It is to accommodate the Government—the Treasury Department. It will give the Treasury Department, as gentlemen will see from the hearings—I do not now recollect, but a great many additional square feet of space. The cost of this increased space will be about \$1.40 a foot, and that is only a little more than we are paying for rent of many buildings. Here is the opportunity, if the gentleman wants to increase the space in the buildings that we have now for the use of the Government.

Mr. MACON. Will this curtail the expenditures for rent?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly.

Mr. MACON. To what extent?

Mr. TAWNEY. The top floor of the Treasury building has heretofore been occupied by a branch printing office in the Treasury Department. The Secretary of the Treasury has recently removed the branch printing office and bindery from the Treasury Department. Now, it is proposed to repair that and enlarge it so that the Supervising Architect's force can all be housed and accommodated on that fourth floor.

At the present time the money and securities of the Government are handled from the third floor clear down to the basement of the Treasury building. Now, it is the purpose of the Secretary of the Treasury to bring all of the people engaged in counting and handling the securities of the Government down on that same floor and thereby consolidate them on one floor, where their work can be supervised more carefully than it can be as it is carried on now on three floors.

Mr. MACON. What would have become of this matter if Congress had not been in extra session?

Mr. TAWNEY. It simply would have waited.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And would have been brought in as a deficiency next winter.

Mr. TAWNEY. We would simply have waited; it would have been that much longer before the improvement could be made in the Treasury Department and before the space could have been utilized.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly not subject to any point of order, and I hope the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] will either make his point or withdraw it.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman intends to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] insists that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MACON] shall either make or withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MANN. Why, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania can not insist upon that. I make the point of order that such a request is not in order.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I merely suggested that I hoped the gentleman from Arkansas would either make or withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MACON. I do not suppose the gentleman would attempt to cut me off from presenting the point of order as I see it. I try to be as courteous to the gentleman as I hope he will be to me in matters of this kind.

Mr. OLMSTED. Why certainly. I merely suggested that I hoped the gentleman would either make it or withdraw it.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, with the assurance of the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY], that this will be a saving in expense to the Government on account of renting other buildings, and that by the new arrangement work can be expedited materially, I, in accordance with my policy of trying to do the very best I can for the efficient service of the Government at all times, respectfully withdraw the point of order as to this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill to inform the committee what the official relation of the Supervising Architect is toward the Treasury Department which requires that his office shall be connected with the Treasury building, while the accounting officers of the Treasury are moved from the building and are located in different parts of the town. I think Members of Congress have had experience in going to the different auditors of the different departments on business, and have been required at the same time to go to the Treasury Department, and they have found it extremely inconvenient, and it must be apparent to anyone that the auditing offices of the Treasury Department ought to be in the Treasury building. I would like the gentleman in charge of this bill, if he can, to tell us why the Supervising Architect is to be continued in the Treasury building, while the accounting officers are removed to buildings outside.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think that it would be more convenient for the Auditor of the War Department to be close to the Treasury Department than to be close to the War Department or for the Auditor of the Navy Department to be in the Treasury building rather than to be close to the Navy Department?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I certainly do.

Mr. MANN. Or that the Auditor of the Post-Office Department should be in the Treasury building?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman's opinion differs from that of almost everybody else.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not in a position to give the gentleman from South Dakota the information that he desires as to the reason why the auditors are moved to other parts of the city and housed in other buildings, and why the Supervising Architect and his entire force is retained in the Treasury building itself, except that in the adoption of that policy the head of the department was no doubt influenced by the convenience of the arrangement and to facilitate the work of these men by putting them either in the building of the department whose accounts and transactions they were called upon to audit or locating them as near to those particular departments as possible.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAWNEY. Just a moment. I can not give the gentleman specific information as to the reasons which moved the Treasury Department to adopt this present arrangement. I do know that it is very essential for the Supervising Architect to be in the Treasury building, because his work is all in connection with other officers who have direct supervision over all of the government buildings in the United States outside of the District of Columbia. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, would it not also require, for instance, in the Post-Office Department, if the auditor was in the Treasury building, that every time they wanted an account passed upon to have to report to the Treasury building before they could get a ruling; and in the War Department, when questions arose, for the officers of the War Department to go to the Treasury each time they wanted a matter settled? Now, while it may be an inconvenience for Congressmen to go to the different parts of the city, it seems to me it is absolutely necessary for the public service that the auditor shall be located where he passes on the different accounts.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And I want to suggest further that the Auditor of the Treasury Department is in the Treasury building.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is manifest that it would be impossible to house all of the people that are employed in the offices of the six auditors of the Government in the Treasury Department. There are some three or four hundred clerks in the Office of the Auditor for the Post-Office Department, if not more.

Mr. BOWERS. Nearly 800.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in response to the suggestion that the auditors ought to be located close to the different departments, I would ask the gentleman from Iowa, who makes the suggestion, why the Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department has just recently been moved to the Union Building, down on G street, between Sixth and Seventh streets?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Part of the navy is there, is it not?

Mr. MANN. And will be moved back before long.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. And the Marine Corps is there.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the question of where they are located and what they are doing is not germane to this bill at all, and I hope that we will get back to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not exceeding \$1,500 of the appropriation for repairs and preservation of public buildings under the Treasury Department, made for the fiscal year 1910, may be used for repair and extension of the platform and building annex to the post-office building at Pittsburg, Pa.

Mr. MACON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas I do not think it is subject to the point of order and he can reserve it; but I want to state that the purpose of this provision is simply this—

Mr. MACON. I just want to ask a question. Does this appropriation exceed the original limit of cost of this building?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; there is no limit of cost at all.

Mr. MACON. Then I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is simply to provide shelter for the automobiles that are used by the post-office in Pittsburg for the

distribution of their mails; it is to protect the property of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

West Point, Miss., public building: For continuation of building under present limit, \$5,000, and the total cost of said building and site therefor shall not exceed the aggregate sum of \$55,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I intended to offer an amendment, but if the point of order lies against the paragraph, it will lie against the amendment. I desire to change the phraseology.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withhold his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order and will let the amendment be read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 23 and 24, on page 5, and lines 1 and 2, page 6, and insert in lieu thereof "West Point, Miss., public building: The limit of cost for the site for building is hereby increased to \$7,500, but the limit of cost for site and building shall not exceed \$55,000."

Mr. TAWNEY. That is to make specific the additional amount. I simply want to say to the gentleman while he reserves the point of order that it has been found impossible to obtain the site within the limit of cost, and before this paragraph was inserted I consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, who satisfied himself as to the necessity of increasing the appropriation for the purchase of site, and that that could be done without increasing the limit of cost which Congress has placed upon the building and the site.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt there are a great many places where public buildings are provided where it is desirable and desired to have some change either in the amount to be respectively used for the site or building, or something else in connection with that building. Now, to say that this does not increase the cost is ridiculous. Either it is now proposed to build a building more expensive than ought to be built with the present appropriation or else it is proposed, if this becomes a law, not to expend enough, because it will use the money now appropriated for the building. Now, I do not doubt that the gentlemen who want to take off from the building and add to the site may be perfectly proper in their theory and desire. I do not believe that in this deficiency bill, which has not passed through a committee, which comes into the House from individual Members of the House, properly, because there are certain things that ought to be taken care of, that they ought to undertake to legislate upon this proposition. The same reason would apply in legislating on behalf of this amendment to a great many amendments. A few years ago an appropriation was made for a building and site in one of the burghs in my city. It was not sufficient to build; it was not sufficient to purchase the site. I did not rush to the Committee on Appropriations and ask for a deficiency appropriation, and if I had, they would have properly laughed at me.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will withhold his point of order so that I can make an explanation, I will be obliged to him.

In the last public-building bill we authorized an appropriation of \$5,000 for a site and \$50,000 for a building at West Point, Miss. It has been found it will be impossible to purchase a site at the price of \$5,000. Consequently it will be necessary to transfer one or two thousand dollars from the building fund to the site fund, without increasing the total limit of cost, however. In other words, what they will receive under this provision for a site in addition to what has already been appropriated will be taken from the appropriation for the building.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is \$50,000 too much or too little to put into a building at this place?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. We have taken into account the total postal receipts and the population of the town, and we usually make an appropriation of \$50,000 for such a town.

Mr. MANN. Well, then, do you reduce the cost of the building by increasing its size, or otherwise?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I understand the Supervising Architect will be able under the conditions prevailing there to spare one or two thousand dollars from the building and add it to the site fund, and yet give them a building satisfactory to their needs.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. May I suggest to the Chairman that the probability is it will be saved in the class of furniture put on the inside of the building?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I accept the judgment of the Supervising Architect.



Mr. MANN. Every gentleman knows that if it were going to change the class of the building or the class of furniture, that the next time we had anything of this sort before the House there would be a proposition to restore this. Why should not West Point have the same class of building that every other city does of the same character and with the same postal receipts? Why should they not have equal furniture to other places? Is it the proposition here to put a cheaper building in West Point than another city like it gets, or to put cheaper furniture in?

Mr. BOWERS. Does the gentleman think there is any material difference between a building that costs \$47,000 and one that costs \$50,000?

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman does not want it, let him leave it in the Treasury.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can not speak for all the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; but, so far as I am concerned, I will see to it that no additional appropriations shall be made for that city, because the Supervising Architect says it will be sufficient. If he deducts the one or two thousand dollars which will be necessary for the site, he will not require any other appropriation to be added to the one made at the last session, and the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will not grant it if I have my way in the matter.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, this does not cost the Government one dollar more than the two appropriations which were formerly passed by Congress. The Treasury Department appointed commissioners to go to the city of West Point for the purpose of locating this building. There were several lots which were offered to these commissioners, and after they had selected a lot they negotiated with the owner of the lot, and the lot could not be purchased within the appropriation. They then instituted condemnation proceedings to condemn the property, and the award was greater than the appropriation. Therefore, the Secretary of the Treasury recommended that he could not erect a building adequate for the city of West Point, because the bill which originally provided for the \$50,000 only provided for so much thereof as might be necessary, but he was unable to take any of the building fund and transfer it to the lot.

These gentlemen, the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, have all those papers with them on file in their offices. The Secretary of the Treasury says that \$47,500 will erect an adequate building, and the work was stopped because he could not get a lot within the present appropriation which he was willing to accept. You can procure a lot in the city of West Point for \$5,000, but it will be located out on the edge of the city, where the Government is unwilling to locate the post-office building. Now, in order that we may get a lot situated contiguous to the business section, get a building acceptable to the commissioners appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of locating this lot, it will take about \$2,500 of the building fund. Therefore there can be no harm done to anybody if you have confidence in your architect who makes this certificate to the chairman of these committees. You must know that he would not certify to anything which would give the people a building which was inadequate for the purpose.

Now, this matter has been held up for quite a while. As the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations well stated, this matter ought to have been attended to at the last session of Congress, but for some reason or other the matter was overlooked. I hope no objection will be made to it, but that Congress will let this work go on, which the architect says is necessary.

Mr. MANN. How could a matter like this be overlooked? We passed a public building bill covering just such items as this in the last Congress.

Mr. Sisson. I was not a Member of Congress at that time. The Supervising Architect informed me that at the regular session, recently closed, he was in hope that the matter would have been taken up, but in the rush of business it escaped attention.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am very much impressed with the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi, as well as the future and past chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. I would like to propound a conundrum to the distinguished gentleman who introduced this bill, and who may very likely be a conferee on it. This throws open the gate; and I will ask him if it is not a fact that there is another distinguished aggregation of gentlemen who will have a look at it? I would not make this remark about any official body, but there are gentlemen who have voracious appetites and who have a great many projects such as this. I would like to know if this bill, when it becomes law, is to be loaded down with work of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds? That is the conundrum I propound to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that propositions similar to this that may be in this bill when it is returned to the House will be considered on their merits; and if in the judgment of the House conferees they are not meritorious propositions, or if they involve an increase in the limit of cost of any building, so far as I am concerned, there will be no proposition of that kind in the bill when it becomes law.

Mr. MANN. But it is a fact that the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, learned, wise, capable in every direction, understanding appropriations of all sorts, is not informed as to provisions for public buildings and grounds except as authorized by law.

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly not. Now, all the appropriations made for public buildings and grounds come from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. All the appropriations do, but the legislation does not. Now, here is the proposition—

Mr. TAWNEY. Suppose this proposition goes out. Will it prevent the other body, of which the gentleman stands in such great fear, from putting as many propositions on the bill as they please?

Mr. MANN. Well, no; it will not be inviting them to do it. But there is a great deal of difference between inviting a man to do that which he does not want to do and that which he is offering to do on his own motion. However, I withdraw the point.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to renew the point of order for the purpose of obtaining information. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there are any other instances similar to this where the money appropriated for the site is inadequate, as has been suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I want to say I am not aware of any other items where the sum of money provided for the site is not adequate. Of course I will not say there are none.

Mr. TAWNEY. Let me say right there, if the gentleman will pardon me, all the cases except these two were taken care of in the little public-building bill we passed the last session of Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood that there was no public-building bill passed.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Yes; there was.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman must have been absent, but there was. It was limited to changes that were found necessary under previous authorizations. There were no new authorizations. There are only two of these cases that have come to my attention.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. In further answer to the gentleman, I want to say that under no circumstances would the former chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds consent to an increase of any appropriation, because that would be unfair to the membership of this House, unless the changes were made necessary owing to the changed conditions in those localities, merely contemplating a change within the limit of cost fixed by the public-building bill; and the chairman of the committee has no objection to those; but where the increase was asked the chairman objected to any such provision in any bill—in this bill or any other.

Mr. STAFFORD. On the statement of the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Minnesota that there are no other instances whereby the other body might load down this bill, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, which the Clerk will again read. The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. TAWNEY] a question. He has just stated, and there are some of us here who have a peculiar interest in that statement as it will appear in the Record, that the two items in the bill now before the House are the only instances of requests of this nature that have been brought to his attention. I wanted to remind him of a request which I consider to come within the provisions of the bill.

Mr. TAWNEY. I want to say to the gentleman from Colorado that these are the only two requests for changes within the limit of cost fixed by Congress. When the gentleman from Colorado submitted his request, it was for an appropriation in excess of the limit of cost, and would therefore be clearly out of order; and as the gentleman knows, the former chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds [Mr. BARTHOLDT] has said that would not be permitted on this bill or on any appropriation bill.

It first requires legislation increasing the cost; and when that legislation is obtained, then an appropriation is made within

that increased limit of cost; but until that legislation can be obtained there is no possibility of securing an appropriation above the amount originally fixed as the limit of cost for that building.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I just wanted the gentleman from Minnesota to understand my position, that I did not want his remarks to go into the RECORD in such a way that it could be considered that no request had been made upon him for the insertion of the item to which I have reference.

Mr. TAWNEY. I was limiting my remarks to propositions for changes within the limit of cost. The proposition of the gentleman from Colorado was for an appropriation for an additional amount, above the limit of cost previously fixed by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, which has been read.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to. The Clerk read as follows:

Quincy, Ill., post-office and court-house: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such additional land as may be necessary for the enlargement of the site of said building: *Provided*, That the total cost of such land, and enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of said building, shall not exceed the total sum of \$100,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the chairman whether this is similar to the paragraph which has just been passed.

Mr. TAWNEY. This is almost on all fours with the case stated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson]. The gentleman from Illinois is familiar with the fact and can make a statement and give the House information in regard to it if it is desired. The appropriation for this site is within the limit of cost.

Mr. STAFFORD. Originally, then, \$100,000 was appropriated for a building and site?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And this is for the distribution of that amount?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; to enable them to get the site which the department demands.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bureau of Engraving and Printing, new building: The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, in his discretion, to procure plans and specifications for the mechanical and electrical equipment of the new building for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing (exclusive of the special features relating to printing and engraving), at the usual rates of compensation for such services, from engineers specially competent by reason of their experience and familiarity with the unusual problems involved in the operations performed in a building of this character.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the paragraph just read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, after line 20, insert:  
"During the fiscal year 1910 all proceeds derived from work performed by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing by direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, not covered and embraced in the appropriation for said bureau for the said fiscal year, instead of being covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as provided by the act of August 4, 1886 (24 Stat., 227), to be credited, when received, to the appropriation for said bureau for the fiscal year 1910."

Mr. MANN. I want to reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order will be reserved.

Mr. TAWNEY. Owing to a recent ruling of the Comptroller of the Treasury, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing finds it will be impossible to do the work which it is required to do under existing appropriations. The work that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has been doing for the Government Printing Office and for the Philippine government has all been paid for and the money used in carrying on the work of that bureau, until the ruling of the comptroller to the effect that under the statute it is mandatory upon every officer of the Government receiving money to deposit that money in the Treasury to the credit of the general fund as miscellaneous receipts. For twenty years, now, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing has been doing work outside of the Treasury Department for other departments of the Government and has been reimbursed for this work out of their appropriations.

That must now cease, under the decision of the comptroller. This is to enable the director of the bureau to continue his work during this fiscal year under existing appropriations, utilizing the proceeds derived from the reimbursement from other departments and the Philippine government in conjunction with the money appropriated for his service. At the next session of Congress either the appropriations will have to be increased for the bureau, to make up the difference between the miscellaneous receipts that are now being used and have been used for twenty years, or else express authority must be given

to the Treasury Department to use these miscellaneous receipts, which must now, under the ruling of the comptroller, go into the Treasury to the credit of the general fund.

Mr. BOWERS. The appropriations made for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the current year were made with the idea that it would be able to use these miscellaneous receipts?

Mr. TAWNEY. Certainly, and they have been used. The reimbursements, as they are called, for a great many years have been used by the bureau, and the appropriations for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the current year were made on that basis.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. How much do they amount to?

Mr. TAWNEY. They amount to about a million dollars. In other words, the appropriations this year will be a million dollars less than necessary to conduct the bureau.

One other item my attention has been called to, and that is the postage-stamp contract. The Bureau of Printing and Engraving has a contract with the Post-Office Department for engraving and printing all of the postage stamps, and the expense of that work has been paid out of the proceeds derived by the bureau under that contract, which proceeds under the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury must now go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts to the credit of the general fund.

Mr. MANN. The amendment which the gentleman offers only relates to the current fiscal year?

Mr. TAWNEY. That is all; I limit it to the current fiscal year because it is very evident that something must be done. We have no opportunity now to go into the question with sufficient thoroughness to determine whether to continue the indefinite appropriations hereafter or appropriate specifically for the entire service.

Mr. MANN. Under the gentleman's amendment might not the bureau do work for private individuals and take the money and put it into their fund?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do not think they can.

Mr. MANN. Do not they do it, and have they not done it for years? Ought they to do it?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; I do not think they ought to, and I know of no instance of their doing it except for the inauguration committees. I believe they all have their engraving done at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman will find that it is not an uncommon thing in some directions for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to do work practically for private individuals, for which the Government is not held accountable, and that they take the money from the private individuals and use it to reimburse the fund.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman that this decision was rendered only within the last week, and there has been no time or opportunity for investigation, and this is offered now merely as a means of meeting the emergency to tide over until Congress will have an opportunity to make such investigation as is necessary before we adopt a permanent policy with respect to the work and compensation hereafter.

Mr. MANN. It is not my intention, Mr. Chairman, to insist upon the point of order, nor do I wish to be understood as reflecting in any way on the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, which I consider to be one of the best-managed bureaus of the Government; but the gentleman from Minnesota and myself and others in the House have stood consistently opposed to permitting money to be paid into various departments of the Government without being covered into the Treasury as a part of the miscellaneous fund, and that proposition is constantly before us, especially in relation to some of the public domains, matters affecting the Forestry Service, and elsewhere. It is not a very good precedent to set at any time. Unless the gentleman's amendment had related to the current fiscal year only I should have objected, but as it is an emergency matter I will withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL. I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota what would have happened if this Congress had not been in session?

Mr. TAWNEY. The bureau would have suspended work for these other departments, because the director would not have had money to go on; he could not use the appropriations that are now available. Take the postage-stamp contract, for example—

Mr. MANN. Oh, they would have transferred a part of it to the Post-Office Department and paid the money. There would have been a little monkey work with the books.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes; it would have been juggling with the books. This is the only straightforward method of meeting the emergency. I do not propose that it shall be a precedent, but merely to continue until Congress is in session next winter, when we can take up the matter consistently and thoroughly.



The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KELIHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, after line 20, insert:

"That during the fiscal year 1910 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized out of the appropriation 'Fuel, lights, and water for public buildings' to furnish steam for the operation of pneumatic tubes of the postal service as heretofore, the proceeds derived from the sale of said steam to be credited to said appropriation."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his amendment is now pending. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WANGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11570, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RETIREMENT OF AGED CLERKS.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed as a House document 2,500 copies of information that the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service has had presented to it on plans for retirement of aged clerks, an annuity and savings plan.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the Chair has been informed that the law fixes the number of copies to be printed as documents.

Mr. GILLET. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the number of copies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that there be printed as a House document the matter to which he has referred. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, what is this?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLET. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is this to which the gentleman refers?

Mr. GILLET. During the last session of Congress, the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service had hearings relative to some plan for the retirement of aged officials. A gentleman who was employed by the clerks made various extensive investigations and collated a great quantity of material. He also acquired facts as to what other governments are doing, and I think that would be very valuable information if printed as a House document.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How much will it cost?

Mr. GILLET. Seven hundred dollars a thousand.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat familiar myself with those hearings. If the tables have ever been completed, it is news to me. The committee was frequently promised, but they were never furnished. After a while the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service will be appointed again, and probably will obtain authority to have necessary printing and binding done, and will be able to print anything that is necessary to be printed. It seems to me to be a very bad precedent every time a committee has a hearing for some one to come in and ask to have that printed as a public document.

Mr. GILLET. These are not the hearings of the committee.

Mr. MANN. Well, what is it that the gentleman wants?

Mr. GILLET. This is the material which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will recognize as having been collated by Mr. Brown very largely for the committee.

Mr. MANN. That material was gathered for the benefit of the committee, and when the committee is appointed it can have it printed. I hope the gentleman will let his request lie over for the present.

Mr. GILLET. Of course if the gentleman objects, that ends it.

Mr. MANN. For the present I object.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and in accordance with the order heretofore made, the House (at 2 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) adjourned until Monday, July 19, 1909, at 12 o'clock m.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 11709) to protect the bank of the Arkansas River at Cummins, Ark.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 11710) to increase the appropriation for a public building at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 11711) authorizing the county of Taos, Territory of New Mexico, to issue bonds for the erection of a court-house—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11712) for the relief of the county of Torrance, in the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 20) requesting the President to transmit to the executives of the States copies of the amendment of the Constitution of the United States, adopted by Congress, relative to taxing incomes, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Williams Pulp and Paper Company, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the retention of the duties proposed by the House on paper, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Messrs. Leggetts & Son and 16 other merchants of Casey, Ill., praying for the removal of tax on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the International Brotherhood of Mill Workers, of Port Edward, N. Y., praying for the continuation of the Dingley rates on paper and wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Cook County League of Women's Clubs, protesting against higher tariff rates on hosiery and gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, relative to federal cooperation in work of road improvement—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, relating to cooly and Mongolian labor—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, indorsing United States Senate bill 8323—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, relating to the investigation of stock exchanges—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the legislature of Wisconsin, petitioning Congress for the establishment of a permanent nonpartisan expert tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A bill (H. R. 11713) to correct the military record of J. W. Young—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 11714) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Gurry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11715) granting an increase of pension to Harrison M. Stratton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11716) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Munklett, alias Henry Reinhardt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROW: A bill (H. R. 11717) granting an increase of pension to Mark T. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11718) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11719) granting an increase of pension to James N. Hamilton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11720) granting an increase of pension to Benton Braden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11721) granting an increase of pension to Silvanus Kisse—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11722) granting an increase of pension to John McGowen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11723) granting a pension to Susan V. Dennison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11724) for the relief of James Mansfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11725) for the relief of William R. McLain—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11726) for the relief of William K. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILMORE: A bill (H. R. 11727) for the relief of James L. Bradford—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11728) granting a pension to Edward Gallagher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 11729) granting an increase of pension to George Spunall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: A bill (H. R. 11730) granting an increase of pension to Seymour S. Sloan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROTHERMEL: A bill (H. R. 11731) for the relief of the Agricultural and Horticultural Association of Berks County, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THISTLEWOOD: A bill (H. R. 11732) granting an increase of pension to B. F. Wilbourn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11733) granting an increase of pension to Elijah W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11734) granting a pension to Parnesia M. Walton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11735) for the relief of R. P. Breeding—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11736) for the relief of the estate of Rev. James Breeding, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEISSE: A bill (H. R. 11737) granting an increase of pension to William Hardenbrook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11738) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Sheldon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CONRY: Petitions of New England Shoe and Leather Association, Hans Rees Sons, Goodbar Shoe Manufacturing Company, Endicott-Johnson Company, Pfister & Vogel, and J. H. Rosbach & Bros., favoring free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New York Mercantile Exchange, favoring decrease of tariff on butter, cheese, and eggs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frederick de Bary & Co., against increase of duty on champagne, wines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Frankfort Insurance Company of New York, against taxing insurance companies by the corporation-tax amendment to H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of American builders of machines for paper making and American manufacturers of paper makers' felts and jackets, against reduction of tariff on wood pulp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of accountants of New York City, against corporation-tax amendment to H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Merchant Marine League, favoring legislation to promote merchant marine of the United States—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania: Petition of James Dewald, favoring more effective immigration laws—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Cigar Makers' International Union of America, against free cigars and tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William J. Madden, of Ottawa, Ill., against taxing receipts of life insurance companies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a petition of Sapp, Pettit & Sapp, of Ottawa, Ill., for reduction of duty on wood pulp and print paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAFF: Petition of merchants of La Moille, Arlington, and Buda, Ill., against a parcels-post law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Petition of Department of Ohio, Grand Army of the Republic, against portrait of Jefferson Davis on silver service of battle ship *Mississippi*—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Paper to accompany resolution to increase the appropriation for a public building at Florence, Ala.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHEFFIELD: Petition of Merchants' Association of Pawtucket, R. I., against the corporation amendment to H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Hide and Leather Association, of New York and vicinity, for free hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. Petrie and others, favoring House schedule on lithographic products (H. R. 1438)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of New York Mercantile Exchange, for reduction of duty on butter, cheese, and eggs—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Company, for exemption from taxation proposed by corporation amendment to H. R. 1438—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce, favoring any measures in legislation to support our merchant marine—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, July 19, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., delivered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God and our Father, ever constant in Thy ministration unto us, Thy children, help us to walk worthy of the precious gifts Thou hast bestowed upon us, and teach us to know the meaning of the ten great commandments, and to have the courage to live them daily is better than to know when, where, and how they came into existence; that to keep a conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow-men is better than all the speculation as to its origin. Hear us, O Lord, and help us to live our convictions of the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 16, 1909, was read and approved.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES.

Mr. MANN, Mr. TAWNEY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia rose.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 11572) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of various bridges across and over certain navigable waters, and for other purposes, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11572) to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of various bridges across and over certain navigable waters, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Chicago, Indiana and Southern Railroad Company, a corporation of the State of Indiana, its successors, and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Grand Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in the city of East Chicago, Lake County, Ind.

The Beaufort County Lumber Company, a corporation of the State of North Carolina, its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Lumber River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between the town of Lumberton and the town of Alma, in Robeson County, N. C.

The St. Louis and San Francisco Railroad Company, a corporation, operating a line of railroad in the State of Arkansas, its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Black River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Pochontas, Randolph County, Ark.

The act of Congress entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, and to establish it as a post-road," approved May 16, 1906, granting the Kansas City, St. Joseph and Excelsior Springs Railway Company authority to construct a bridge at Kansas City, Mo., is hereby revived and reenacted and so amended as to extend the time for commencing and completing the structure therein authorized one and three years, respectively, from May 16, 1909.

The county of Ouachita, in the State of Arkansas, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Ouachita River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Camden, in said county and State.

The Indiana Harbor Belt Railroad Company, a corporation of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, are hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in Thornton Township, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.